R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 095 EA 000 496

EVALUATION AND SELECTION IN THE 1966-67 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION INTERNSHIP PROGRAM.

BY- CREAGER, JOHN A.
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

REPORT NUMBER ACE-RR-VOL-1-NO-3 PUB DATE 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.20 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *PERSONNEL SELECTION, *FELLOWSHIPS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, CONTROL GROUPS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

PROCEDURES USED IN THE 2D YEAR TO SELECT FELLOWS IN ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION FOR A PROGRAM INITIATED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION WERE SIMILAR TO THOSE USED IN THE PROGRAM'S 1ST YEAR. THE PROCEDURES FOLLOWED THIS SEQUENCE--(1) PRESIDENTS OF MEMBER INSTITUTIONS NOMINATED PERSONS OF OUTSTANDING ADMINISTRATIVE PROMISE, (2) EACH INTERESTED NOMINEE SUBMITTED A DOSSIER FOR EVALUATION BY FOUR-MAN TEAMS COMPOSED OF COUNCIL MEMBERS, AND (3) TWO 30-MINUTE INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED AT SIX REGIONAL CENTERS BY THREE-MAN TEAMS COMPOSED OF COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS. THE DATA REVEALED (1) SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES EXISTED BETWEEN NOMINATING INSTITUTIONS AND THE TOTAL 1,013 ACE MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, (2) PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS RESPONDED TO NOMINATION INVITATIONS ABOUT ONE-HALF AS OFTEN AS THE TOTAL ACE MEMBERSHIP, AND (3) LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES WERE ALSO SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERREPRESENTED, AND UNIVERSITIES AND TEACHERS' COLLEGES WERE OVERREPRESENTED. COMPARISONS MADE BETWEEN WINNERS AND NONWINNERS REVEALED THAT WINNERS WERE MORE LIKELY TO HOLD THE DOCTORAL DEGREE, TO HAVE HIGH SALARIES, AND TO HAVE A NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS. A CONTROL GROUP COMPOSED OF TWO NOMINEE-CHOSEN COLLEAGUES WHO WERE NOT INTERESTED IN ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION PERMITTED NOMINEE AND CONTROL GROUP COMPARISON. THE CONTROL GROUP CONSISTED ALMOST ENTIRELY OF FACULTY MEMBERS WHILE A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE NOMINEE GROUP HELD POSITIONS OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION. THE INITIAL PROCESS OF SELECTIVITY AND PRESCREENING BY THE NOMINATING PRESIDENTS OF MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, THE PROCESS OF DOSSIER SCREENING ON THE BASIS OF INTELLIGENCE, ACADEMIC AND PUBLISHING ACHIEVEMENT, AND THE FINAL INTERVIEW EVALUATION WERE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATED AIMS OF THE PROGRAM. (GB)

ED012095

ACE
RESEARCH
REPORTS
VOL. 1 • NO. 3, 1966

EVALUATION AND SELECTION IN THE 1966-67 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

JOHN A. CREAGER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH
AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON EDUCATION

A 000 496

Evaluation and Selection in the 1966-67 Academic Administration Internship Program

John A. Creager

A five-year internship program for Fellows in Academic Administration was initiated by the American Council on Education in the fall of 1964, under a grant from the Ford Foundation. The details of this program, which is designed to identify people with potential for academic administration and provide them an opportunity to broaden their knowledge and experience through a one-year internship in a college or university other than their own, have been described by Cox (1966).

At the same time, the Office of Research initiated a program of research on and evaluation of the operational program. Initial research findings from the first year of the program were presented in an earlier article (Astin, 1966). The present report describes the selection of and preliminary research findings on the 1966-67 interns, who were chosen at the end of the first year of the program. Because in a program of this type it is important to know what facts are stable from year to year, this report will present comparisons of this year's results with those found by Astin (1966) for the first year.

Selection Procedures

In general the selection procedures for the second year were very similar to those used in the first year. Presidents of the member institutions of the Council were asked to nominate a person considered to have outstanding promise for a career in academic administration. Each nominee submitted a dossier consisting of a letter of recommendation from the nominating president, complete graduate and undergraduate transcripts, an application form, and an essay (maximum: 1000 words) commenting on an article dealing with the selection of academic administrators (Hutchins, 1964). Of 218 dossiers submitted - nearly

double the number received in the first year of the program - 26 were eliminated for miscellaneous administrative reasons (incomplete application, candidate exceeded the age limit, etc.). The remaining 192 were evaluated by one of seven four-man teams, composed of members of the professional staff of the Council. Each candidate thus received four dossier ratings, one from each judge, on a 5-point scale: Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Doubtful, and Unacceptable. The essays were included as part of the dossier rating rather than separately evaluated. On the basis of these ratings 150 candidates were selected for interviews; six of these withdrew.

Two thirty-minute interviews[1] of each of the remaining 144 candidates were conducted at six regional centers by three-man teams composed of college or university presidents (or vice presidents) and members of the Executive Staff of the Council. Each interviewer rated the candidate's over-all potential as well as a set of traits, selected for their presumed relevance to success in academic administration and for their presumed amenability to being judged in a brief interview. As in the first year, each candidate was discussed by the members of the two teams and internships offered to those judged most promising as academic administrators. From the 144 interviewed candidates, 50 interns were selected. Ten of these declined - because of other professional commitments or personal reasons - leaving 40 interns.

Two refinements in the rationale for selection were made more explicit in the second year. First, administrators of the academic programs in higher education were distinguished from those who administer the business, fiscal, and physical operations and emphasis placed on potential academic administrators. The distinction is one of emphasis, since such persons will be involved in other matters and with persons in other phases of academic life and therefore need to be appreciative of these related areas. The second refinement consists of selecting

[1]The second-year interviews were 10 minutes longer than the first-year interviews.

those most likely to "grow " during and as a result of the internship program, those most likely to develop into academic administrators, in contrast to those who have already arrived and to those not interested in or competent for the administrative role.

Additional Information Obtained in the Second Year of the Program

Each candidate was also asked to complete a research questionnaire (the Nominee Questionnaire) of 376 structured items concerned with his interests, hobbies, daily activities, and self-concept. This is essentially the same instrument completed by the first-year group, except for the addition of some decision-making itemswhich seem to have considerable relevance to the program. This questionnaire was used for research purposes only, not in the selection procedures, though the candidates were not informed of this when they were asked to complete it.

As in the previous years each candidate was asked to name two colleagues from his institution, who were similar to him in age and background but were not interested in academic administration. With the permission of the candidates, 254 such "control" subjects were asked to complete the Nominee Questionnaire and to provide some of the information normally provided by candidates on their application form. Questionnaires were received from 237 of the controls, and 234 of these were usable in subsequent processing (92 percent of 254).

To provide an additional sample for purposes of comparison, these questionnaires were also completed by 46 new academic deans attending the Council's Institute for Academic Administrators held in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and Chicago, Illinois, in the spring of 1966.[2]

---

[2]The cooperation of Dr. David C. Knapp, Director of the Institute for College and University Administrators and of the deans who agreed to fill out the questionnaires is gratefully acknowledged.

The Nominating Institutions

Tables 1 and 2 compare the characteristics of the nominating institutions with those of the 1,013 four-year institutions which were members of the ACE in 1966 and which were described in the 1960 edition of American Colleges and Universities (Irwin, 1960). Data presented in Table 1 are percentages of institution having certain characteristics designated by the Office of Education; data in Table 2 are distribution statistics on freshman input, environmental orientation, and other characteristics developed by Astin (1965), for which a mean of 500.0 and a standard deviation of 100.0 constitute the ACE norms. These tables present data from both the first and the second year of the program for comparison and include some data not previously presented for the first-year group.

It is apparent that the institutions which participate in the program differ with respect to several characteristics from the ACE membership at large. The percentage of private institutions responding to the invitation to nominate a candidate is only about one-half the percentage within the ACE membership, though during the second year there was a small increase. Although both sectarian and nonsectarian institutions are under-represented, there has been an increase in the participation of the nonsectarian institutions and a decrease in sectarian participation, especially by Catholic institutions. Participation by institutions predominantly of one sex or race is similar in both years, with Coeducational institutions participating more frequently than expected from their percent of the ACE population.

In both years the universities and colleges are significantly over-represented in the nominating samples, and liberal arts colleges under-represented. Technical institutions are slightly, but not significantly, under-represented.

Table 1

Percentage of Nominating Institutions in Various Categories

Characteristics	ACE Membership N=1013	Nominating Institutions First-Year Nominees[a]	Second-Year Nominees N=192
Support			
Private	78.5	39.8b	42.0b
Sectarian	53.3	31.6b	24.8b
Protestant	41.9	19.4b	16.6b
Roman Catholic	11.4	12.2	8.3
Nonsectarian	25.2	8.2b	17.2c
Demography			
Predominantly Negro	2.9	4.1	3.8
Predominantly Men	10.3	7.1	7.0
Predominantly Women	15.6	4.1b	5.7b
Coeducational	74.1	88.8b	87.3b
Program			
Liberal Arts College	63.8	38.8b	36.9b
University	26.4	42.9b	40.8b
Teachers College	5.7	16.3b	17.8b
Technological Institution	4.1	1.0	3.2
Region			
Northeast	29.4	24.2	22.5c
Southeast	23.7	19.1	19.4
North Central	28.1	33.1	34.7c
West & Southwest	18.8	23.6	23.5

[a]from Astin (1966).

[b]$p < .01$ for deviation from ACE Institutions

[c]$p < .05$ for deviation from ACE Institutions

Table 2

Distribution Statistics for Freshman Input, Orientation and Other Characteristics of Nominating Institutions[a]

Characteristic	First Year Nominees N=98 Mean	S.D.	Second Year Nominees N=192 Mean	S.D.
Input Factors				
Intellectualism	500.1	86.5	518.1c	93.6
Estheticism	483.8	69.9	490.0	81.5
Status	498.5	74.1	502.0	90.7
Pragmatism	546.8b	89.8	544.0b	94.7
Masculinity	518.0	82.2	516.7c	81.1
Orientation				
Realistic	544.8b	88.6	542.4b	92.4
Scientific	497.3	79.6	512.2	88.5
Social	481.1	82.8	477.2b	89.6
Conventional	541.6b	81.2	524.0b	91.9
Enterprising	509.2	79.2	499.3	89.9
Artistic	475.3c	74.4	480.1b	82.8
Other				
Budget per student	515.2	108.5	526.1b	108.5
% Freshman males	518.6	76.0	521.1	82.5
Size	581.3b	103.8	578.3b	101.2
Selectivity	500.6	88.1	521.6b	91.6

[a] Means have been set at 500.0 and standard deviations have been set at 100.0 for the ACE membership (Astin, 1965b).

[b] $p < .01$ for deviation from ACE institutions.

[c] $p < .05$ for deviation from ACE institutions.

The regional distribution of participating institutions, which was not previously reported, is practically identical for both years: the East is slightly under-represented and the North Central and West and Southwest are slightly over-represented.

In Table 2, the most striking deviation from the normative ACE mean of 500.0 occurs in both years on size of the nominating institutions, a fact consistent with the previously noted over-representation of colleges and universities. Since technical and business curricula are more likely to be found in the university than in the liberal arts college, it is not surprising that nominating institutions have relatively higher scores on the Realistic and Conventional Orientations, and on the Pragmatic freshman input factor and relatively lower scores on the esthetic and social characteristics associated with the liberal arts colleges. Some change can be noted in terms of the "affluence" variables, i.e., per-student operating budgets, and selectivity. In the first year, nominating institutions were typical of ACE membership in "affluence," as measured by per-student operating budgets and selectivity (Astin, 1966), but in the second, they tended to be more affluent. This change is consistent with Astin's earlier finding (1965) that universities tend to score higher on the affluence variables.

Tables 3 and 4 compare the characteristics of institutions nominating winners and nonwinners for the two years of the program. On a given characteristic, the effects of the selection procedures can be seen by comparison with its base rate for the total nominee sample given in Tables 1 and 2. However, as Astin has pointed out, such differences could also reflect either the effects of selection or institutional differences in the characteristics of nominating persons. It should be noted that in a program of this type some significant year-to-year

Table 3

Percentages of Winners' and Nonwinners' Nominating Institutions Having Various Characteristics

Characteristics	First Year[a]		Second Year	
	Winners	Nonwinners	Winners	Nonwinners
Support				
Private[b]	25.0	44.6	50.0	38.7
Sectarian[b]	25.0	33.8	32.6	21.6
Protestant	12.5	21.6	13.0	18.0
Roman Catholic[b]	12.5	12.2	19.6	3.6
Nonsectarian[b]	0.0	10.8	17.4	17.1
Demography				
Predominantly Negro	8.3	2.7	2.2	4.5
Predominantly Men[b]	4.2	8.1	10.9	5.4
Predominantly Women[b]	4.2	4.1	10.9	3.7
Coeducational[b]	91.6	87.8	78.2	91.0
Program				
Liberal Arts College[b]	25.0	43.2	42.3	35.1
University[b]	70.8	33.8	43.5	39.6
Teachers college	4.2	20.3	8.7	21.6
Technological institution	0.0	1.4	4.4	2.7
Region				
Northeast	20.8	23.0	23.9	24.3
Southeast[b]	12.5	21.6	23.9	17.1
North Central	37.5	33.8	34.8	32.4
West & Southwest[b]	29.2	21.6	17.4	26.1

[a]from Astin (1966)

[b]Significant changes in the differences between winners and non-winners in the two years.

Table 4

Distribution Statistics of Winners' and Non-winners'

Nominating Institution Characteristics

Characteristic	First Year				Second Year			
	Winners		Nonwinners		Winners		Nonwinners	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Input Factors								
Intellectualism	531.0	55.6	490.1	92.5	529.8	94.6	513.2	93.2
Estheticism	484.0	59.3	483.7	73.3	489.3	100.6	490.3	72.7
Status	517.1	65.9	492.5	76.0	521.6	77.3	493.9	94.9
Pragmatism	576.8	77.6	537.0	91.8	547.7	92.8	542.5	95.9
Masculinity	531.5	55.5	513.7	89.1	533.9	76.3	509.6	82.3
Orientation								
Realistic[b]	568.4	74.5	537.1	91.8	533.1	90.8	546.2	93.2
Scientific[b]	524.4	68.6	488.5	81.3	517.7	81.2	510.0	91.7
Social	456.4	68.7	489.1	85.8	461.4	75.9	483.8	94.2
Conventional	546.6	67.2	540.0	85.6	536.6	96.2	518.9	90.0
Enterprising	525.2	64.2	504.0	83.2	522.7	71.6	489.6	95.0
Artistic	461.0	67.2	479.9	76.4	477.5	91.8	481.1	79.2
Other								
Budget per student[b]	557.3	97.0	501.5	109.1	523.8	121.3	527.1	103.3
% Freshman males	528.3	65.8	515.4	79.1	529.0	108.0	517.9	79.6
Size[b]	620.5	118.2	568.6	96.1	577.4	89.6	578.6	96.2
Selectivity	537.7	76.0	488.5	88.9	535.0	88.1	516.0	92.8

[a] from Astin (1966)

[b] Significant changes in the differences between winners and nonwinners in the two years.

variations in statistics may be expected, particularly in the early years, when the general aims of the program are translated into operations and these in turn become more clearly understood by participating institutions.

Differences between the winners' and the nonwinners' nominating institutions are striking and show some marked shifts from the first to the second years of the program. Whereas selection favored nominees from public institutions the first year, the reverse is true in the second year, a shift most marked for Catholic and private-nonsectarian institutions. In view of the drop in Catholic institutions' participation, this result suggests that in the second year, some of these institutions selected themselves, leaving those with better nominees participating.

In contrast to the first-year selection, which favored coeducational institutions, the second-year selection favored nominees from predominantly men's or women's colleges. A clue to all these differences is given in the data for type of academic program. In both years those from teachers colleges tended not to be selected, but a dramatic shift occurred with regard to university versus liberal arts college nominees. First-year winners came predominantly from universities and nonwinners from liberal arts colleges; but this difference has nearly disappeared in the second year. In view of program aims and of available data on the background qualities of successful academic administrators, this shift may be a favorable one. Much depends on the program's seeking to identify potential administrators from smaller institutions who might otherwise be missed. Second-year selection was slightly more favorable to the Southeastern institutions and less so to nominees from Western institutions. This is probably related to the shift in terms of size, affluence, and Realistic Orientation noted in Table 4.

The pattern of institutions, baccalaureate, graduate, and nominating was examined for the 192 candidates. This was done to ascertain whether candidates were more likely to be nominated if they were working at institutions from which they had obtained one or more of their degrees. The pattern was also examined separately for winners and nonwinners to ascertain whether selection favored those with one or another institutional pattern. The percentage of each group with each institutional pattern is presented in the following table:

Pattern	Winners	Nonwinners	Candidates
Same nominating & baccalaureate institutions; different graduate institutions	20.00	11.97	14.06
Same nominating and graduate institutions, different baccalaureate institution	6.00	6.34	6.25
All three institutions the same	2.00	2.82	2.60
Same baccalaureate and graduate institutions, but different nominating institution.	14.00	11.97	12.50
No matching institutions	58.00	66.90	64.59

Slightly less than one-fourth of the candidates are nominated by institutions which granted one or more of their degrees. Most of these were nominated by the institution from which the candidate received the baccalaureate degree. Furthermore the selection process tended to favor candidates nominated by their baccalaureate institutions, especially if they did their graduate work elsewhere. However, among those candidates not nominated by an institution where they obtained a degree, those obtaining both baccalaureate and graduate degree from the same institution were more likely to be selected as interns than those with no matching institutions.

Background Information from the Application Form

A number of items of information from the application form were tabulated separately for winners and nonwinners and for the total nominee group. Some of these same items were also available from the control group. Descriptive information similar to that obtained on the nominating institutions was also obtained for the undergraduate and graduate institutions attended by nominees and controls. Nominees were somewhat more likely than were controls to have obtained the baccalaureate degree in a liberal arts institution and thus to have lower means on Pragmatism and Realism. No significant differences were found between nominees and controls with respect to the characteristics of graduate institutions attended. Comparisons of winners and nonwinners show a similar pattern with respect to both undergraduate and graduate institutions. The winners are more likely to be graduates of Catholic institutions, and of institutions higher on Intellectualism, Estheticism, and Status Factors, and on Enterprising Orientation. These differences are consistent with those for the nominating institutions; they probably reflect the tendency of a given nominating institution to recruit its staff members from institutions similar to itself. The differences between winners and nonwinners, with respect to characteristics of institutions attended, that were noted by Astin for the first-year group did not hold up the second year, a change consistent with the shift in winner-nonwinner differences previously found for the nominating institutions.

Table 5 summarizes the background information provided by winners, nonwinners, and the total group of nominees on the application form. Where available, corresponding information is given for the control group. In addition, nonwinners are categorized in terms of the stage at which they were eliminated - after their dossiers were evaluated or after they were interviewed - and the same information

Table 5

Background Characteristics of Second-Year Groups[a]

Characteristics	Unit	Winners	Non-Winners	Nominees[b]	Controls	Dossier Eliminees	Interview Eliminees	Significance Comments[c]
Current Position								
Administrator	%	26	31	29	2	56	20	.01 on type of elim.
Dean	%	28	44	25	1	22	24	NSD
Department Chairman	%	14	13	13	13	5	16	NSD
Professor Faculty	%	80	79	80	89	56	88	.01 on type of elim.
Status								
Salary	$/yr.	15,060	11,500	12,460	--	10,510	11,940	.05 on both
Faculty Service	years	5.46	5.14	5.23	--	2.80	6.16	.01 on type of elim.
Rank	5-pt. scale	3.32	3.39	3.36	3.42	2.56	3.76	.01 on type of elim.
Administrative Experience								
Faculty Committee	%	44	53	50	--	30	63	.01 on type of elim.
Department Office	%	34	37	36	--	17	46	.01 on type of elim.
General Admin.	%	90	74	78	--	79	71	.05 on win/nonwin
Student Life	%	48	28	34	--	43	21	.01 on both
Publications								
Journal Articles	N	4.69	3.27	3.70	--	1.55	4.05	.01 on both types
	% 5 & more	48.00	32.40	36.60	--	--	--	--
Books	N	.27	.26	.26	--	0.00	0.38	.05 on type of elim.
	% 5 & more	14.00	11.80	12.40	--	--	--	--
Admin. Article	N	1.10	0.83	0.91	--	0.90	0.80	NSD
Educational Background								
Doctorate or equiv.	%	88	72	76	72	45	84	.05 on win/nonwin
Graduate GPA	4-pt. scale	3.49	3.52	3.51	--	3.37	3.58	.01 on type of elim.
Undergraduate GPA	4-pt. scale	3.21	2.98	3.04	--	2.75	3.08	.01 on type of elim.

a Percentages in each category
b Six withdrawals excluded
c Comparisons made for winners vs.nonwinners and for interview eliminees vs. dossier eliminees; NSD= No Significant Differences.

is presented. In interpreting characteristics for the group eliminated after the interview, one should realize that these subjects were prescreened by the dossier evaluation.

Judging by the information available, the major difference between nominees and controls is the position held at the time of application. The controls consist almost entirely of faculty and a few department chairmen, but an appreciable portion of the nominee group already holds positions in academic administration. A significant percentage of those in general administration, however, were eliminated by the dossier evaluation, presumably because they were in nonacademic forms of administration or because they had already "arrived." Most nominees and controls are professional level faculty and, if such candidates are eliminated, they are more likely to be eliminated at the interview stage, than at dossier evaluation stage and for other reasons. Other current positions are too rare for significant analysis.

An appreciably greater salary difference between winner and nonwinners is found in the second-year group than was found in the first-year group; for both years, however, winners have the higher average salary. Dossier evaluation tends to eliminate those with lower salaries, probably because salaries are related to rank and institutional salary scales. Length of service at faculty status is typically five to six years; nominees eliminated by dossier evaluation tend to have much more limited academic experience.

Experience in various kinds of administration yielded no significant differences on the first-year group. In general, this is true of the second-year group also. However, in the second year an appreciably larger proportion of candidates reported administrative activity in the Student Life category, winners differed significantly from nonwinners, and nonwinners were more likely to be

eliminated at the dossier stage. The significant difference found in the General Administration category is probably an artifact of the dependency among the coding categories.

For both years, winners have significantly higher publication rates than nonwinners. This is especially true of journal articles. Some nominees appear to have been eliminated because of nonpublication at the dossier stage of evaluation. No significant differences among groups were found with respect to marital status, year of birth, number or age of children, or participation in civic affairs.

Information about educational background yields significant differences on both attainment of the doctorate degree and grade-point averages. Winners are significantly more likely to hold a doctorate than are nonwinners, a confirmation of the first-year results, and nondoctorates are more likely to be eliminated by dossier evaluation. The percentage of all candidates with a doctorate was higher in the second year. Some elimination at the dossier stage appears to be based on the candidate's having very low grades, especially at the undergraduate level, where, in fact, the grade-point averages have greater variability. Grade-point average differences between winners and nonwinners, however, are not significant.

The second-year groups' academic fields at both baccalaureate and graduate levels are summarized in Table 6. Baccalaureate fields are similar for nominees and controls, though nominees tend to have more degrees in psychology, history and miscellaneous fields, and to have fewer degrees in the rest of the liberal arts and humanities. At the baccalaureate level, selection favored those with degrees in English, journalism and other arts and humanities and disfavored those from education and social sciences. However, for graduate fields, nominees who received their highest degree (usually the doctorate) in the social sciences or English were more likely to be selected than were those who received their highest degree in education.

TABLE 6

Academic Fields of Study of Second Year Groups[a]

Academic Field	Baccalaureate				Highest Degree			
	Winners	Non-winners	Nominees	Controls	Winners	Non-winners	Nominees	Controls
Bio Sciences	12.0	11.0	11.3	13.2	10.0	6.6	7.5	9.8
EMPS [b]	20.0	15.4	16.7	18.8	10.0	13.2	12.4	18.4
Education	4.0	9.6	8.1	6.8	16.0	30.9	26.9	15.4
English & Journalism	18.0	10.3	12.4	11.1	14.0	8.1	9.7	8.5
Psychology	6.0	5.9	5.9	2.6	4.0	4.4	4.3	3.4
History	12.0	15.4	14.5	11.5	16.0	7.4	9.7	10.7
Social Sciences	6.0	11.7	10.2	9.8	10.0	4.4	5.9	7.4
Arts & Humanities	8.0	5.9	6.5	16.6	10.0	9.6	9.7	17.5
Other [c]	14.0	14.7	14.5	9.4	10.0	15.4	13.9	8.5

[a]Percentages of each group in each field

[b]Engineering, Mathematics, and Physical Sciences

[c]Architecture; Business, Commerce, and Law; Geography; Home Economics; Library Sciences; Physical Education; and Unknown.

The Dossier and Interview Evaluation

The average dossier rating was used in selection during the second year to screen out 42 candidates prior to the extensive interview process. This decision was based in part on the previously reported correlation of .66 between the average dossier rating and the average final interview rating. As a result this correlation can be computed directly only for those candidates who were interviewed; the corresponding correlation for the total candidate group can only be estimated. For the screened group the obtained correlation between average dossier and interview rating is .39, and for the total candidate group the estimated correlation is .57, not significantly different from that obtained on the first-year group. These results confirm the earlier finding that the dossier evaluation has substantial validity for screening. Continued use of this procedure is therefore justified especially as the size of the candidate group increases and as the interview procedure comes to require more administrative logistic effort and interviewer time. No change in the cutting point for dossier elimination seems necessary.

The essays were not separately evaluated during the second year; rather they were considered in the overall dossier evaluation, with no apparent effect. The estimated validity of the dossier evaluation this year is identical with that obtained by direct measurement of the dossier only (without the essay) during the first year. This confirms the implication of the first-year data that the essay evaluations do not add to the validity of the prescreening.

The general picture of the relations between various kinds of background information available from the dossier and the dossier evaluations is also supported by the results of regression analysis of the mean dossier ratings. A multiple correlation of .55 was obtained from the dossier information;

most of the reliable variance in the dossier ratings can be attributed to higher educational achievement as evidenced by attainment of a doctorate degree, undergraduate grades, and scholarly publication. Persons high on these three items, and those somewhat younger were more likely than nondoctorates and nonscholars to be passed at this stage for the interview. Since these items are indicative of functioning and productive intelligence, the group interviewed has been essentially prescreened to some extent for this quality.

Regression analysis of the application information and the dossier ratings against the final ratings raised the correlation in the screened group from .39 (using the dossier rating alone) to .55. This indicates that the screening validity of the dossier ratings can be improved by making some changes in the weights given to information from the application: greater weight should be given to undergraduate grades, and less weight to departmental office and faculty committee service. If at first sight this recommendation seems strange, it should be remembered that the analysis of the dossier ratings gave considerable weight to attainment of the doctorate degree and related intellectual achievements. This suggests that the undergraduate grades of those candidates with a doctorate have still further screening validity for the final interview rating. On the other hand, because those with administrative experience as faculty members probably have a doctorate and better undergraduate grade records, knowledge of this experience is not helpful to the dossier raters. Table 5 shows that those non-winners with administrative experience on faculty committees or in departmental offices were more likely to have been eliminated this year at the interview stage. The evidence indicates that they could have been eliminated at the dossier stage.

At the interview stage, ratings of eleven traits plus an overall final rating were obtained. The three additional traits rated this year are Enthusiasm, Conviction, and Ability in Personal Relations. The mean ratings on each trait were correlated with the mean final ratings. The correlations indicate the degree of importance which the judges placed on these traits in making their final ratings.

Trait	Correlation with Final Rating	
	First Year	Second Year
Intelligence	.84	.74
Ability in Personal Relations	---	.73
Quality of Speech	.74	.68
Cultural Level	.73	.61
Candor	.65	.61
Enthusiasm	--	.56
Poise	.62	.54
Personal Appearance	.56	.54
Conviction	--	.45
Aggressiveness	.44	.43
Extent of Speech	.34	.27

These correlations form a rank order pattern identical with that found during the first year, though they are all somewhat lower because the dossier eliminations has restricted the variance in the interviewed group. The drop is greatest for Intelligence and for those traits most highly related to Intelligence. This result is to be expected, in view of the previously noted characteristics of the dossier evaluations and the prescreening based on them. The absolute magnitude of the correlations is larger for those traits more highly

related to Intelligence: Ability in Personal Relations, Quality of Speech, and Cultural Level. In both years, the judges distinguish Quality of Speech (articulateness) from Extent of Speech (garrulousness). These results indicate that a functioning intelligence is judged to be more important than Personal Appearance or excessive Aggressiveness. It should be noted that some of these traits seem bipolar in nature and an inspection of rater comments on the rating sheets suggests that some judges regard a middle-scale position as preferable on such traits. For example, mild indication of enthusiasm and conviction is not regarded as unfavorable to the candidate, and complete lack of such indication may be deemed undesirable by the judges; however, an excess of these traits may be interpreted as opinionatedness or as over-compensation for lack of self-confidence. Put another way, where the dossier is evaluated on the basis of intelligence functioning in a scholarly way, the interview evaluation shifts emphasis to intelligence as expressed in direct personal confrontation, such as might well be common in academic administrative life. The resulting selection results in interns who, on the average, are intelligent and scholarly, but not bookworms, who are socially at ease, and who are skilled in personal relations even when "on the spot."

The intercorrelations among the mean ratings on these traits are again all positive and highly significant, indicating some halo effect, in the sense of a general liking. However, the patterns of these correlations suggest two group factors beyond the single general factor, which in fact is rather weak. The judges make meaningful distinctions in their judgements. One strong factor, already noted, consists of intelligence functioning in a social context and accounts for high intercorrelations among ratings on Intelligence, Quality of Speech, and Cultural Level. A second factor, not quite as strong and only

slightly related to the first (through halo) consists of Aggressiveness, Enthusiasm, Conviction, and Extent of Speech. This group of traits appears to reflect perception of a nonintellective personality factor by the judges. Poise, Personal Appearance, Ability in Personal Relations, and Quality of Speech tend to cluster, indicating that rated Quality of Speech is a result of intelligence combined with poise in the interview situation. The ratings of Candor are also more complex, but tend to relate to Appearance, Intelligence and Quality of Speech.

The Nominee Questionnaire

Response patterns to Part I of the Nominee Questionnaire, which consisted of the same items administered to the first-year groups, are essentially identical for both the first-year and second-year groups. These same items, particularly those of a given type, differentiate candidates and controls in the same way for both years. Candidates express greater interest than controls in all administrative positions, whereas controls prefer being "distinguished professors." Candidates prefer to work in teachers colleges and junior colleges, but unlike last year, they also prefer medium-size and small private institutions. The candidates are markedly and systematically different from the controls in personality: they are more extroverted, they perceive themselves as skilled in social and interpersonal relations, they are more likely to read for pleasure, they participate more in social and civic activities and in sports and games. They also rate themselves higher on emotional stability and are more optimistic, self-controlled, and self-confident than the controls, who admit to emotional irritability, wakefulness at night and pessimism. The controls again give the picture of being more scholarly, intellectual, and relatively introverted persons.

Part II of the questionnaire, which was new this year, consists of opinion items on desirable degree of faculty influence in decision making, the relative

importance of various criteria for faculty evaluation in different types of institutions, and criteria for picking an academic dean for a private liberal arts college. Understandably the controls prefer more faculty influence in decision making than do the candidates. For evaluating faculty, the candidates give greater weight to student evaluation of faculty, community service, total effectiveness with students, and committee or administrative service than do the controls. These weights are essentially the same regardless of type of institution considered. On the criteria for picking an academic dean, only one item yielded a significant difference: the controls thought graduate work in liberal arts or the social sciences more important than did the candidates.

In a comparison of the responses of the winners and nonwinner, only 20 items showed differences significant at the 5 percent level where 18 would be expected by chance out of 376 items. Only three items were significantly discriminating at the 1 percent level during both years of the program: nonwinners are more likely to find working in a junior college appealing, more likely to watch television, and less likely to argue with students. It is apparent that whatever discriminating power the questionnaire items have, it is picked up at the nominating stage of the selection process and not at the dossier or interview stage. This suggests, first, that the nominees have in effect been somewhat prescreened by the presidents' nominations because of certain aspects of personality, interest, activity, and opinion, and second, that further differentiation on these items is not likely to be obtained during the process of evaluating already nominated candidates. However, if some questionnaire items not presently distinguishing winners from nonwinners turn out to be valid for follow-up criteria currently being obtained, they would be potentially useful in the selection process, especially if they are not already distinguishing candidates from controls.

A sample of 46 academic deans also responded to the Nominee Questionniare items. These respondents, who had one to five years of incumbency, were self-selected to participate in the seminars for academic deans operated by the ACE's Institute for College and University Administrators. An appreciable portion of the group were from the smaller institutions and had been chosen for the position of dean from faculty ranks within their institution. Their performance as administrators is not known, and the sample is small. More extensive information on a larger sample of deans and on a sample of college presidents will probably be gathered.

The responses of the deans to Part I of the questionnaire typically fall between those of the internship nominees and of the controls on the question of the desirability of college presidency, but are closer to the nominees in revealing interest in becoming an academic vice-president or provost. The deans also lie between the nominees and controls on self-ratings of emotional stability, self-control, most leadership items such as ability to make administrative decisions, and most items having to do with sociability. They indicate greater understanding of problems of faculty, curriculum, and governing boards, and less of student needs, than do the nominees. Their general interests, compared to those of either the nominees or the controls, are oriented more toward arts and humanities than toward scientific and technical areas. They also spend less time in professional reading, television viewing, or special projects. However, they are more likely to have read the listed books on academic life and administration, especially those by Barzun and Hutchins, than are either nominees or controls.

Summary and Conclusions

This study, an analysis of the candidates and selection procedures in the second year of the Internship Program for Fellows in Academic Administration,

attempts to replicate and elaborate results from the analysis of the first year's program (Astin, 1966). Both studies are concerned with characterizing the participating institutions, the nominated candidates, and the non-administratively oriented controls, and with the evaluation and selection of candidates. In general, there is marked agreement in the results obtained from the first two years of the program. These results may be summarized as follows:

1. The two samples of participating institutions deviate from the ACE membership population in similar ways. The percentage of private institutions nominating candidates is about one-half that of the ACE membership. There is greater participation by coeducational universities and colleges, and less participation by liberal arts and technical institutions.

2. Both samples show the typical candidate to be extroverted and active, in contrast to the more introverted, passive, scholarly, and intellectual faculty members not especially interested in academic administration.

3. The validity of the mean dossier ratings as a pre-interview screening device was established in the first year and confirmed in the second year sample.

4. Winners are more likely than nonwinners to hold the doctorate degree, to have high salaries, and to have a number of publications. However, there were some changes in the likelihood that a winner would come from a particular type of institution, although institutional selectivity, per se, is confirmed.

5. No evidence that the essay contributes positively to the selection procedure was obtained.

In addition to confirming the first year's results, except for the few minor differences, the present study provides further comparison of internship candidates and controls with a small sample of academic deans, who generally fall between

the candidates and controls on the most relevant items, with shifts that would be expected from the fact that deans have already "arrived" in a particular type of academic administrative position.

The replicated evidence appears to be consistent with the stated aims of the program. It remains to relate this information to follow-up information currently being obtained from interns and unselected candidates (that is, non-winners). The finding that nominees and controls differ appreciably on a wide range of relevant items indicates that the nominations are definitely selective, and do some effective prescreening of possible candidates before the dossier evaluation. This fact increases the difficulty of making fine distinctions among those who remain, but decreases the evaluation load first at the dossier stage, and later at the interview stage. Moreover, dossier evaluation screens out those with limited intelligence, and limited academic or publishing achievement, whereas the interview permits the evaluators to take a close look at the remaining candidates for evidence of intelligence and emotional stability in a social situation where the candidate, rather than his "paper" dossier, is under scrutiny. It is difficult to see how such a procedure can be improved until the aims of the program and the selection operations have been tested against longer range outcomes. While our research will continue to ascertain the characteristics of nominee and control groups, especially to discover the stability of the results from year to year, the most significant results will probably come from future studies of follow-up data. It is expected that these follow-up studies will provide a basis for evaluating the impact of the program and for improving selection techniques.

References

Astin, A. W., "Research Findings on the Academic Administration Internship Program," Educational Record, Spring 1966, pp. 173-184.

Astin, A. W., Who Goes Where to College? Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.

Cox, L., "The A.C.E. Academic Administration Internship Program," Educational Record, Spring 1966, pp. 163-172.

Hutchins, R. M., "Our Misconception of University Leads to Mis-Selecting Heads," Los Angeles Time Syndicate, 1964.

Irwin, M., American Universities and Colleges. Washington D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.